

SUMMARY MEETING REPORT

**Marine Fisheries Advisory Committee (MAFAC)
Columbia Basin Partnership Task Force (CBP Task Force)
Meeting #1
*Portland, Oregon - January 24 & January 25, 2017***

OVERVIEW

The first Marine Fisheries Advisory Committee (MAFAC) Columbia Basin Partnership Task Force (CBP Task Force or task force) meeting took place at the Port of Portland Headquarters in Portland, Oregon and spanned one and a half days from January 24 – 25, 2017. Barry Thom, Regional Administrator for the West Coast Region and Michael Tehan, Assistant Regional Administrator for the Interior Columbia Basin, represented NOAA Fisheries leadership at the meeting. Peter Shelley, MAFAC Liaison, MAFAC Ecosystem Subcommittee Chair, and Senior Counsel and Acting President for the Conservation Law Foundation, and Heidi Lovett, Policy Analyst and MAFAC Manager, NOAA Fisheries, represented MAFAC at the meeting. For a full list of task force member attendees, see *Appendix A*.

The meeting was the first to convene the CBP Task Force. Members include representatives of the Columbia River Basin (the basin) tribal and state sovereigns (including the states of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington) and stakeholders from throughout the basin. The task force members were introduced to each other; confirmed their interest in engagement; discussed related problems and challenges; and volunteered to assist with subgroup work between meetings.

Over the course of the one and a half day meeting, task force members discussed the following topics with each other and NOAA Fisheries staff:

- The Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA); CBP Task Force roles and responsibilities; NOAA Fisheries' vision; Proposed Operating Principles; and purpose and proposed process framework
- Hopes and expectations for the CBP Task Force
- Proposed process scope and framework
- Building a common foundation of understanding
- Overview/discussion regarding definition of success
- Work approach
- Defining a proposed approach going forward, next steps, and summary

This report summarizes the major meeting discussions, action items, and next steps for the CBP Task Force.

DISCUSSIONS

DAY 1 – January 24, 2017

Welcome, Invocation, Opening Remarks, Introductions, and Agenda – Marla Harrison, Port of Portland, Zach Penney, Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission, Barry Thom, NOAA Fisheries, and Deb Nudelman, Kearns & West

The meeting began with a welcome from Marla Harrison, Environmental Planning Manager, Port of Portland, and an invocation from Zach Penney, Fishery Science Department Manager, Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission.

Barry Thom welcomed the group and thanked attendees for their interest in collaborating as a CBP Task Force member. He provided opening remarks explaining that the task force is intended to provide a forum for tribes, sovereigns, and stakeholders in the basin to jointly share information and work together to develop long-term goals for salmon and steelhead. This process began in 2012 with the Columbia River Basin Assessment¹ - which identified the need for common goals, the integration of salmon recovery efforts, and regional leadership in developing an effective path forward. NOAA Fisheries subsequently hosted a series of meetings and informational workshops in 2015 – 2016. He asked task force members for a round of introductions. The members and audience introduced themselves by name and affiliation.

Facilitator Deb Nudelman, Kearns & West, thanked Marla, Zach, and Barry for the opening remarks. She explained that this meeting was an opportunity for task force members to learn more about the process, ask questions, and to engage in dialogue with other tribes, sovereigns, and stakeholders. She walked members through the agenda and meeting materials, proposed approach and logistics, and asked for clarifying questions.

Overview of FACA, MAFAC CBP Task Force Roles and Responsibilities, NOAA Fisheries' Vision, and Rough Draft Proposed Operating Principles

What is a FACA? What is MAFAC and the MAFAC CBP Task Force? What are the roles and responsibilities of the MAFAC CBP Task Force Members? – Heidi Lovett, NOAA Fisheries

Heidi Lovett provided an overview of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA). FACA was enacted in 1972 and applies to any advisory group that has at least one member who is not a federal employee. It is a formalized process for organizing and overseeing bodies that provide advice to federal agencies. It ensures that advisory committees provide relevant and objective advice; are open to the public; have balanced and diverse membership; and comply with cost controls and record keeping requirements.

MAFAC is NOAA Fisheries' only FACA-approved advisory committee (FAC) and the only FAC created to advise NOAA and the Secretary of Commerce on all living marine resources issues. The

¹ Columbia River Basin Assessment: <http://ruckelshauscenter.wsu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/ColumbiaRiverBasinSalmonandSteelheadLong-TermRecoverySituationAssessment-FinalReport.pdf>

MAFAC Committee has between 15 to 21 members and meets several times a year. MAFAC has five standing sub-committees, and when topics arise that require expertise beyond that found on MAFAC, they can establish a task force of external members to provide the needed expertise. The CBP Task Force was established to provide additional expertise and support MAFAC's work. The FACA process has several administrative requirements that the CBP Task Force must follow, including providing adequate advance notice in the Federal Register and providing public access to papers and records produced by the task force. Any recommendations from the task force must go through the parent committee (MAFAC) before submission to the NOAA Fisheries Administrator. For Heidi's full PowerPoint presentation, see *PowerPoint #1: FACA and MAFAC Overview*.

MAFAC Liaison – Peter Shelley, MAFAC

Peter Shelley stated that it is important that all points of view and perspectives of the CBP Task Force members are brought forward through this process. It is his goal to attend meetings and stay informed of the ongoing task force activities. As the liaison, he wants to ensure that MAFAC understands the information and recommendations developed by the CBP Task Force for submission to NOAA Fisheries.

Questions and Answers/Comments – MAFAC CBP Task Force Members

Deb Nudelman asked task force members for questions on the topics covered. The following are highlights of the questions asked, answers provided, and comments made.

- There is a need for information and a common definition regarding ecosystem effects; these are key factors in this process.
- What is the process of the CBP Task Force making recommendations to MAFAC and MAFAC providing those recommendations to the NOAA Fisheries Administrator? Does MAFAC edit the recommendations?
 - Peter and Barry will provide regular updates on the CBP Task Force efforts to MAFAC to keep them aware of progress. In the past, MAFAC has read other task force recommendations carefully, asked for points of clarification, and suggested including additional perspectives if it may be needed; however, the content is generally not substantially altered. A FAC may add or suggest additional expertise to the process prior to forwarding recommendations to an agency Administrator, however, MAFAC has full confidence that the diverse CBP Task Force membership will take all views into consideration while formulating recommendations for its consideration.
- What is MAFAC's perception of issues related to ESA-listed salmon in the Columbia River Basin?
 - MAFAC members have been hearing about the ongoing issues in the basin for decades and it is their belief that they will learn a lot from the expertise that the CBP Task Force members bring. There is some excitement that this task force structure could be a template for complicated fishery issues around the U.S.

NOAA Fisheries Vision of Success – Barry Thom, NOAA Fisheries

Barry articulated NOAA Fisheries’ vision of success: to work together openly and honestly; to share information; listen to each other’s viewpoints; and seek a common understanding of the current state of salmon and steelhead and of where to go as a group. The objective of this process is to define the direction for salmon and steelhead for decades to come. NOAA Fisheries will use the recommended goals developed to help guide decision-making on recovery priorities, biological opinions, and agreements on harvest and mitigation. A set of common goals will help managers make long-term decisions, evaluate progress, and better navigate various shorter-term challenges. More clearly defined goals will increase the chance of being achieved. This process provides task force members with the opportunity and responsibility to help shape the future of fish and to develop solutions that work for all members.

NOAA Fisheries anticipates that the work of the CBP Task Force, through MAFAC, will help inform decisions and consultations on viable ways to recover listed species while meeting NOAA’s tribal trust responsibilities, sustainable fishing mandates, and ensuring an opportunity to consider regional views. If the task force members can come together to reach agreement on long-term goals and achieve consensus on recommendations, that will carry a great amount of significance going forward. For Barry’s full PowerPoint presentation, see *PowerPoint #2: Task Force Overview*.

High Level Review of Proposed Operating Principles – Deb Nudelman, Facilitator, Kearns & West

Deb introduced the rough draft Proposed Operating Principles to the task force members and provided a high-level review. She explained that the rough draft document was the project team’s (NOAA Fisheries and Kearns & West) early first effort to provide proposed guidelines for a constructive and productive process. The draft proposed document outlines the task force’s background; purpose, scope, and product; guiding principles; structure; member participation and public interactions; decision-making and recommendations; relationship to MAFAC; ground rules; and safeguards.

Deb walked task force members through the document, asked that they carefully review it and provide their feedback, revisions, and any issues they may have. She said that Kearns & West would distribute the rough draft document after the meeting and provide two weeks for members to review and provide their feedback. The project team will consider all requested edits, develop a revised draft document, and send it to task force members in advance of the next meeting. Once the task force reviews the final draft at the next meeting, the goal is that they adopt the revised Operating Principles going forward.

Questions and Answers/Comments – MAFAC CBP Task Force Members

Deb asked task force members for questions on the discussed topics. The following are highlights of the questions asked, answers provided, and comments made.

- How do you define where “above and below Bonneville” is? Does this include the Willamette Basin?

- NOAA Fisheries has the need and aspirations to consider the entire Columbia River Basin, including the Willamette Basin. The task force can chose to focus on topics in any area that they have an interest in discussing.
- Native Americans have managed sustainable fisheries for thousands of years. How can that be incorporated into this document?
- What does it mean to look at species level? Please provide some definitions of terms to ensure that task force members are on the same page.
- It is important to discuss the issue of coldwater refuges in the basin.
- Is there a need to clarify how this process coordinates with the Columbia River Treaty? How does this relate to other forums in the basin? Connect these processes.
- It is vital to have dialogue on ecosystems and ecosystem functions.
- What constitutes as a recommendation from the task force?
 - There was a recommendation that the group strive for consensus and have a plan for when/if consensus cannot be reached.
- What is the recourse to ensure that the recommendations of the task force get through MAFAC and to the Secretary?
 - The process of forwarding the task force recommendations through MAFAC and to the Assistant Administrator, on behalf of the Secretary will be transparent, and the hope is to earn trust and build credibly between the agency and task force members. To ensure transparency, reports from the task force and MAFAC will be open to the public (via the MAFAC and West Coast websites). MAFAC will carefully read recommendations and provide additional ideas, modifications, and edits to help serve and guide policy to the agency. The hope is that MAFAC helps to improve recommendations with their expertise.

Overview of CBP Task Force Purpose and Proposed Process Framework – Barry Thom, NOAA Fisheries

Barry said that the purpose of the CBP Task Force is to provide a forum for a science-based, results-driven, transparent, and publicly-embraced process to recommend integrated goals for Columbia Basin salmon and steelhead, listed and non-listed, that incorporates long-term conservation and harvest/fishing, and supports regional and local efforts. NOAA Fisheries has multiple responsibilities such as the Endangered Species Act (ESA), Magnuson-Stevens Act, and treaty/trust to tribes. Barry noted that there are also state and tribal management responsibilities and multiple plans and goals in the basin to integrate. Without commonly shared goals, it is difficult to achieve any of them. NOAA Fisheries has no specific outcome in mind and hopes that others will use the results of this process in their decision making just as NOAA Fisheries will use in guiding recovery priorities and biological opinions.

The task force will provide Columbia Basin entities with an opportunity to engage with broader stakeholder communities and work together to define the future of salmon. It will also serve as the forum for task force members to discuss and understand the rationale for disagreements; to learn about and consider integrated efforts across habitat, hatchery, harvest, and hydro activities; to identify opportunities to influence and develop relationships; to develop input and feedback; and to lead discussions on basin-wide issues.

Barry suggested a proposed framework including: defining the purpose of the task force; identifying the current conditions and guidance; determining a shared vision and goals for salmon; identifying, analyzing, and selecting alternatives; and ultimately defining success. For example, the task force could consider topics such as harvest; escapement; stream and estuary habitat; hydropower; fisheries; hatchery; predation; and climate and how they interact with each other to influence achieving goals.

Questions and Answers/Comments – MAFAC CBP Task Force Members

Deb asked task force members for questions and comments on the concepts presented. The following are highlights of the questions asked, answers provided, and comments made.

- For ESA recovery goals, will they be established in the biological opinions or will this forum be used?
 - The ESA goals are established in the ESA recovery plans; however, the task force should determine how to integrate those goals with all the other fish goals in the basin through this process. Instead of groups working on goals through an isolated approach, the task force could provide input to help those in the basin achieve integrated goals.
- A matrix with various goals throughout the basin to address some of the current information gaps would be helpful.
- What is needed for de-listing?
- Define what is a “must have” and “nice to have,” analyze a range of options, and consider how goals would be implemented.
- What are the limiting factors to achieving the goals?
- Should we consider prioritizing certain areas?
- We must inventory what we have and consider every opportunity to recover, what is there, and determine the cost of impacts (i.e., thermal pollution).
- We should have a conversation about thermal pollution.
- If the task force members reach consensus on goals, is there an expectation that we would then use life-cycle models to evaluate how we would achieve those goals?
- The recommendations should complement mandates and include what and how to implement them.
- Analyze aspirational, practical, and realistic goals; then determine how to get buy-in for them by tribes, stakeholders, and others in the region.
- If the task force prioritizes goals, what is the feasibility of accomplishing them?
- There are multiple ways to get to ESA recovery; test the ideas for how with this group.
- Setting all regulatory and legal concerns aside, what is possible on the landscape? Look at the hatcheries and determine what is out there.
- How can a product stand up regardless of the current landscape?
- Determine what the recommendations are and how to get there.

Hopes and Expectations for the MAFAC CBP Task Force

What are your hopes, expectations, and interests for this meeting? What would success look like for the overall MAFAC CBP Task Force process? – MAFAC CBP Task Force Members

The CBP Task Force members were asked to share their interests, hopes, and expectations for the process. Members stated that they were glad to use this opportunity as a way to open the dialogue with each other. The following are comments shared by task force members, identifying what needs to be done to begin, what they hope to accomplish during the process, expected achievements, and what success might look like at the end of this process.

- There is a need to better understand the history of salmon goals, harvest to date, and what it will take to reach recommended goals.
- Information on the current efforts in the basin should be provided to inform participants on what is and what is not realistic going forward.
- There is hope to identify what has not worked in the past and to avoid similar efforts in the future.
- Defining where things are now, integrating what is currently happening, and determining where they need to go will help set a baseline for prioritization.
- Consider discussing integration with industry and federal agencies for consideration, as well as reviewing products from other processes.
- Educate task force members on the cultural and spiritual role salmon and steelhead have on people's lives including treaty/trust responsibility and that the basin provides direct food resources to hundreds of communities.
- Salmon is an icon of magic, hope, and renewal in the Pacific Northwest; this aspect should be integrated to sustain cultural significance.
- Create common definitions of terms such as trust, recovery, and the geography of the region that this process addresses (e.g., what does upper, mid, and down river mean?).
- This process can be used to establish and build relationships based on transparency, trust, and accountability to move forward together.
- The hope is that this process will help increase communication amongst members to avoid unnecessary litigation in the future.
- Success is working together to support, explain, and argue passionately to defend the outcomes of this process in any venue, friendly or unfriendly, public or private.
- Work to identify commonality between task force members and how that is defined in terms of reaching goals.
- This process provides the opportunity to listen, learn, and offer expertise as well as ask to approach issues from each other's perspectives to meet all interests.
- Identify a solution that works towards long-term, lasting, and sustainable change for all interests at the table.
- There are a lot of unresolved issues that need to be addressed between members in order to move forward.
- There is interest in using this interaction to explore and help resolve conflicts.
- Approach recovery goals with a known understanding that climate change will affect this region.

- Consider that the water is getting warmer so there is a need to understand pursuing clean energy options; this is a challenge that needs to be addressed.
- There is a need to focus on habitat and identify what types will get the group closer to the recommendations that they are looking for.
- Focus groups could be used to understand what is happening with habitat in certain areas and where there is habitat available.
- Success would be seeing the habitat seeded and meeting the needs of nutrient cycling and animals.
- In order to make this effort successful, it must go beyond legal mandates and achieve social buy-in to the point that goals achieved benefit from the resource.
- Provide rate-payers with low cost power, achieve stewardship, and help NOAA Fisheries fulfill its needs.
- There is recognition that task force members represent a diverse range of interests and many stated that it is their hope is to have their voices equally heard.
- There is a sense of process fatigue and this forum is a place for reasonable and efficient dialogue.
- Use this collaborative process to ensure efficiency, transparency, trust, and accountability to the actions in the basin and establish long-term success.
- There is a hope for honest, respectful, and respectable communication between all members at the table and to focus on interest-based discussion.
- There is optimism that with this approach, the members will be able to identify a problem statement; understand each other's challenges; stay realistic; reach region-wide progress; and agree on a path forward collectively.
- Determine the roles and responsibilities for salmon recovery and look for a win-win solution for all members in order to reach consensus.
- One milestone objective is to develop a common vision for broad sense recovery for salmon and steelhead both culturally and socially.
- Another objective would include integrated restoration, while incorporating regulated actions, and reaching actualized goals.
- Avoid creating goals that will pile on to the current goals, instead develop sustainable solutions that address all interests (e.g., tribal, energy, food, water users, fishing, agriculture, irrigation, and fisheries), and identify resources to integrate them.
- Consider developing key stocks for recovery or specific goals for parts of the basin based on habitat.
- There is hope that this conversation will be robust and useful; develop goals and recommendations that can be implemented by decision makers; and sustain the way of life in the Pacific Northwest.
- If healthy stocks are achieved, healthy fisheries will result.
- Achieving broad sense recovery goals is a historic and unique opportunity to develop policy with a diverse group of interests.
- Reaching consensus on recovery goals and recommendations is in the best interest of many members.
- Some members stated that recovery means to bring stocks back so that they are healthy and then build recovery on those stocks.

- There is a need to develop clear roles and responsibilities in regards to recovery and get to de-listing (and beyond) through their recommendations.
- Using innovative and integrated techniques, develop effective approaches to get to sustainable recovery and fisheries.

DAY 2 – January 25, 2017

Review on Day 1 and Review Agenda for Day 2 – Deb Nudelman, Kearns & West and Barry Thom, NOAA Fisheries

Deb opened the second day of the meeting, welcomed the task force, walked members through the agenda and meeting materials, and asked for clarifying questions. She also asked for a round of introductions. The members and audience introduced themselves by name and affiliation.

Barry welcomed the group and thanked task force members for keeping an open mind on the topics discussed. There is a lot of potential to learn from each other in terms of successes and challenges in moving forward.

Process Scope and Framework

Introduce Detailed Proposed Process Scope and Framework – Michael Tehan, NOAA Fisheries

Michael Tehan described an example process scope and framework to elicit ideas and to initiate dialogue between members. He shared some early rough draft concepts that NOAA Fisheries developed based on their experiences and conversations with task force members. He asked task force members for their thoughts on the process scope; whether they should focus on a geographic pilot area, weak or strong populations, and/or one or multiple issues. The structure of the discussion can take on a wide range of approaches including beginning with high level visionary thinking and moving towards small, regional discussions. He emphasized that the process scope will be up to the task force so their opinion, critique, and feedback is invited and welcome. In an effort to structure topics and break up tasks, the process framework might be organized around five fundamental questions:

- Why are we here? (i.e., process definition)
- Where are we now? (i.e., current guidance and conditions)
- Where do we want to go? (i.e., shared vision and goals for salmon)
- How do we get there? (i.e., identification, analysis, and selection of alternatives)
- How do we know when we are there? (i.e., definition of success)

For Michael's full PowerPoint presentation, see *PowerPoint #3: Proposed Process Scope and Framework*.

Process Scope and Framework Facilitated Group Discussion – MAFAC CBP Task Force Members

Deb asked the task force members to consider the concepts that Michael presented and invited reactions, questions, and suggestions to the proposed scope and framework. When you think about moving through the process of developing goals for salmon and steelhead, does this framework

make sense? Do you have other ideas? What are your thoughts? Task force members provided the following responses to the questions.²

Why are we here?

- Some task force members stated that they are here because they have never unraveled the pieces and worked together towards common goals.
- This topic becomes very complicated once habitat, hatchery, harvest, and hydro activities and components in the basin are considered.
- There is a need to define abundance versus productivity in various plans, as well as hatchery versus wild fish.
- To ensure that the discussion is designed to address what the reality of the situation is, where to go from a goals perspective, and allow the group to firm up goals.
- There is a need to determine where this group wants to go, the alternatives, and how fast might ignite more dialogue.

Where are we now?

- In order to move forward with improvements, the task force needs to understand the current conditions to improve upon.
- What are the current issues members are dealing with when it comes to predation? Fish are being eaten by sea lions and this is a big problem.
- Determine what the current passage survival rate is at each facility and by stock.
- What are the laws, rules, and processes have to be followed to begin?
- There is a desire to achieve goals that goes beyond de-listing; however, in order to define that there is a need to know the numbers that are in the recovery plans.
- There are a series of issues that need to be considered in terms of defining the scope to move forward.
- What are the geographic areas this group is considering?
- Will this process cover fish issues, habitat, or both?
- How will the members consider the entire basin together and avoid focusing on one area?
- Consider using a map and ask members to share what they are currently doing in their area as an analysis tool.
- If we cannot get to recovery from natural production, what else can we focus on?
- Determine the other factors that gets this group to establishing goals.

Where do we want to go?

- Determine the steps that it will take to get certain areas to produce with current conditions and determine the cost, the timeframe, and the effects.
- Discuss tributary habitat restoration and what the fish do when they leave that habitat.

² Note that the responses from task force members were categorized, as appropriate, beneath each of the proposed questions in an effort to organize the thoughts shared on the proposed process approach.

- The goals in the recovery plans and habitat capacity might be a good place to start; however, there is a continued frustration with focusing on habitat and the inability to integrate the other Hs.
- There is a need to be inclusive and balance it with being realistic in determining goals; the level of detail that could be explored in this process is endless. This group cannot spend a credible amount of time and work on over 200 populations.
- Discuss how habitat (i.e., including temperature and passage through the main stem) produces and its potential.
- Focus efforts on the improvement and rehabilitation of habitat.
- Discuss quality, and quantity, goals and get beyond de-listing numbers.
- Agree on high level goals (i.e., meeting ESA, etc.) and limiting factors (i.e., habitat, hatchery, and harvest).
- Consider these factors and include them in the habitat conversation.
- What is tributary habitat currently capable of producing and what is the range of possibility for productivity?
- What is the habitat above blocked areas capable of producing?
- Need to maximize the potential of habitat to produce fish.
- What are the other pieces of information the group needs to link these questions and conversations together?
- There must be viable economics.
- It is very important that the members agree that they have a right to exist and that it makes sense economically.
- What is realistic in terms of what recovery will cost?
- What can we do to improve the economics of the process?
- Consider the full life cycle of the fish.
- How can we manage habitat capacity throughout the lifecycle?
- Start tributary specific and as you roll up, involve more management aspects.
- Consider looking at specific fish at a particular time.
- We are really looking at a combination of stocks.
- Once the goals are developed, we must work to develop a formula to get to those goals.
- What are the issues that we are trying to solve and how do we go from looking at those individually to collectively?
- If there is an investment in infrastructure, ensure that it uses expert knowledge on how to improve it; do not take steps backwards.
- Look at ways on how to rebuild infrastructure when they come up for NOAA Fisheries to consider.

How do we get there?

- In order to get from where we are today to goal setting, the definition of success might be to begin the dialogue about how to get there.
- Ask parties to share their sideboards (i.e., not decimating infrastructure or jobs) and to stay realistic (i.e., salmon will not recover everywhere).
- Look for innovative projects with win-win outcomes.

- There is a need to create an image of what salmon prosperity looks like and not tackle more than the task force can handle in this process.
- Do you have enough of an understanding of limiting factors and how they affect our goals to get to success?
- Can we isolate limiting factors?
- Create a model that supports minimal frictional costs to minimize the costs and economic damages to others.
- How can the task force integrate new practices while ensuring cultural and social prosperity for all of the interests in the basin?
- Do not draw hard lines for solutions (i.e., “you are out and we are in”).
- Focus on how partnerships can benefit everyone.
- Do not put people out of business; aim to develop ideas on how to improve existing practices and move all interests forward cooperatively.

Building a Common Foundation of Understanding

Current Fish and Fishery Status in a Historical Context – Ray Beamesderfer, NOAA Fisheries

Ray Beamesderfer, Associate, NOAA Fisheries, presented the current fish and fishery status in a historical context by providing an overview on long-term trends, hatchery mitigation, escapement and viability, fisheries, and all-H integration. Ray shared a map of the Columbia River Basin stretching up to British Columbia, Canada, and several graphs that identified long-term declining harvest trends of salmon and steelhead (hatchery and wild). He presented the Bonneville Dam counts and the 20-year average showing that the species has declined significantly from pre-development estimates.

Hatchery mitigation programs have used hatchery releases to help mitigate these declines and releases are spread throughout the basin. The total return to the Columbia River mouth is now predominantly hatchery fish. While hatcheries have bolstered current runs, the status of wild fish has continued to decline. The majority of wild stocks are now listed under the ESA although several non-listed stocks remain viable. The historical management trends of fisheries shows that harvest rates of Columbia River fisheries have steadily been reduced as wild stock began to decline. Current fishing rates on wild stocks range from a few percent up to about 60% with a large share of the higher rates occurring in marine fisheries from Oregon to Alaska. He noted that the challenge in defining goals will be to understand implications for how these effect all-H integration. For Ray’s full PowerPoint presentation, see *PowerPoint #4: Where are we now? Current Fish and Fishery Status*.

Regulatory and Policy Background Regarding Columbia Basin Salmon Goals – Michael Tehan, NOAA Fisheries

Michael presented on the regulatory and policy background regarding Columbia Basin salmon goals including the ESA; Northwest Power and Conservation Council (NPCC); Tribes, States, hatcheries, and fisheries. He explained that the goal of listing species under the ESA is intended to stop the decline of the species and achieve ESA with the ultimate goal of recovery. Recovery plans are required but are guidance rather than enforcement documents. Recovery plans have been completed

for most of the listed salmon and steelhead in the basin and many of the task force members have been instrumental to developing these documents. The goal is to improve the species status to a point where they can be delisted. The NPCC aims to provide an affordable and reliable energy system while enhancing fish and wildlife in the basin through their basin and sub-basin plans. These plans identify a basin-wide vision for salmon, basin-wide goals and sub-basin objectives.

The Columbia River Treaty Tribes established the Spirit of the Salmon Plan, which was developed by the Columbia River Intertribal Fish Commission and is significant because it combines elements from all four tribes for restoration of Columbia Basin fish and fisheries. This plan addresses the entire lifecycle of salmon as they go to the ocean and return. Plans and policies for salmon have also been developed by individual tribes throughout the basin. Guidance regarding salmon goals may also be found in plans and policies developed by each of the states in the region. Many of these state plans have been integrated into its ESA salmon recovery plans developed with NOAA fisheries. Montana does not have anadromous fish; however, the management of their water is key to the basin.

Hatchery plans and policies exist for a variety of mitigation programs including but not limited to the Mitchell Act, Lower Snake River Compensation, and John Day Mitigation. Guidance for fishery management is identified in U.S. v. Oregon, and agreements, the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, and Pacific Fishery Management Treaty. For Michael's full PowerPoint presentation, see *PowerPoint #5: Regulatory and Policy Background on Goals*.

A Case Example: Grand Ronde Spring Chinook – Patty Dornbusch, NOAA Fisheries

Patty Dornbusch, ESA Recovery Coordinator, NOAA Fisheries, presented the Grand Ronde spring chinook case example to help task force members understand what various types of goals look like as they apply to a specific geographic area. She stated that ESA recovery, broad sense, mitigation, and fishery goals are identified for spring Chinook populations in the Grand Ronde and Imnaha sub-basins. ESA recovery goals aim to provide for a species that is stable and self-sustaining over the long-term and that is not threatened or endangered. For ESA de-listing, every major population group (MPG) in an evolutionary significant unit (ESU) has to be low risk.

Broad sense goals go beyond de-listing to incorporate cultural, ecological, social, and economic benefits. Mitigation goals are intended to provide for production lost due to dams and other factors. While mitigation goals include goals for natural production, a large portion of mitigation comes from hatchery production. Fishery goals are approaches for managing fisheries sustainably and do not determine the number of fish to be harvested in the future. The U.S. v. Oregon forum is an example of an agreement that identifies how harvest is allocated between treaty and non-treaty fisheries. Patty walked the task force members through examples of these various types of goals as they have been applied to the spring Chinook populations in the Grand Ronde/Imnaha sub-basins. For Patty's full PowerPoint presentation, see *PowerPoint #6: A Case Example, Grand Ronde Spring Chinook*.

Public Input

Audience members were offered the opportunity to provide public input. Deb asked audience members if anyone would like to share ideas and suggestions with the task force members and no one responded.

Introduction to Defining Success Discussion – Debra Nudelman, Kearns & West

Deb asked task force members to consider the potential outcomes of this process using the following questions:

- What does success look like?
- How do we move toward success?
- What are examples/characteristics of successful processes, collaborations, or partnerships that could help this Task Force move forward?

Discussion – MAFAC CBP Task Force Members

Task force members provided responses to the questions. The following are highlights of the answers provided and comments made.

What does success look like?

- Success would mean that there are more fish and fisheries are meeting their numeric goals; incremental benefits.
- Using flows more efficiently and effectively for fish; seeing net gains with more water is a clear benefit.
- NPCC set goals for anadromous fish and this process might be a way to successfully meet those objectives.
- First, achieve de-listing and then double or triple the fish in fisheries; get the bell shape curve going again.
- Achieving broad-sense goals.
- Eliminating hatchery production because natural populations are producing on their own.
- Populations should be abundant enough to do away with harvest closures along the coast.
- Several participants stated that success would ensure a high level of certainty and that the return of investment on fish and wildlife would be strategic, avoid litigation, and deliver actionable results.
- Success takes the form of justifying the money spent on fish and wildlife by showing improvements through efficiency and effectiveness.
- Ensure that salmon conditions are not affecting the rate-payers/utilities to a point that forces them to diversify away from their power supply.
- Protect the image that utilities are viewed as responsible and environmentally friendly.

How do we move toward success?

- Moving towards success, there is a need to conduct fishing seasons that sustain healthy industries.
- It is about getting weak stocks to a place where they can withstand incidental harvest and are viable while healthy and hatchery stocks are assessed.
- Achieve smolt to adult ratios that allow incidental harvest to occur on weak stocks and greater abundance of other stocks.

- Determine goals for the tribes and this process.
- Link the business conducted in the basin to salmon recovery (i.e., using dredge material to benefit salmon).
- Develop in ways that enhances salmon recovery and determine what this looks like (i.e., how do you de-ice without causing damage and enhancing aquatic resources?).
- Discover ways to go above and beyond what is required from a regulatory perspective.

What are examples/characteristics of successful processes, collaborations, or partnerships that could help this Task Force move forward?

- A few participants offered specific examples including the Yakima and Klamath Basins as successful collaborative processes to learn and model from.
- In one example a task force member shared, they said that the #1 thing that led to collaborative success was building a respectful, trusting environment and strong relationships between adversaries.
- Several participants mentioned that no one was going to survive with the status quo and the only way to get anything done was to do it together.
- Develop realistic goals that everyone in the group can live with.
- Ensure that the objectives and goals are clear; this is imperative to know the scope in which you are dealing.
- Map out the timeframe considered (i.e., the next 30 years), identify what is needed to get where you want to be, and how you are going to do it.
- Ensure that funding parameters are set.
- If possible, identify a private group to obtain funding from Congress for a project.
- In another example shared, parameters were set in terms of funding, and establishing clear goals and objectives was imperative to moving forward.
- A good facilitator is helpful to make sure that everyone is being heard.
- Have a safe place where you can listen to each other.
- Identify common interests.
- Realize that collaborative groups work to provide stability and economic viability.
- If you do not work with each other, there will be one rotating crisis after another; recognize this.
- If you are saying no to something, provide an alternative.
- Make sure that everyone's basic needs are met in some way.
- Create certainty for all interests so that no one is an absolute winner or loser.
- Work towards Congressional approval.
- Any good settlement has to be durable enough that everyone gets something out of it.
- Put yourself in each other's shoes; ask others what they need and tell them what you need (i.e., give and take).
- Consider the alternatives to the process (i.e., best and worst case scenarios).
- Develop a dispute resolution process within the agreement so parties can work out their issues without litigation in the future.

Introduction to MAFAC CBP Task Force Work Approach Discussion – Deb Nudelman, Kearns & West

Deb asked task force members to take the information they have heard and shared during this meeting and discuss the approach needed to address this process by using the following three questions:

- What questions need to be addressed by the process to begin to identify common goals?
- What are the issues/topics that need to be addressed for this process to be useful to your interests?
- What are the related information needs?

For the full PowerPoint presentations, see *PowerPoint #7: MAFAC CBP Task Force Work Approach* and *PowerPoint #8: Developing a Work Plan*.

Discussion – MAFAC CBP Task Force Members

The following are highlights of task force members' questions and comments.

What questions need to be addressed by the process to begin to identify common goals?

- What do the salmon need to survive?
- What are our sideboards and what is our scope?
- What kind of outcomes are we driving towards?
- What substance do we need to inform this process?
- Do we need to look at numbers?
- Are the hatcheries in the basin doing good work? If not, maybe consider getting resources from somewhere else.
- Where is the funding for implementation coming from?
- What does adequate habitat look like and what does it cost to get to escapement? Consider hatcheries as well.
- How do we make informed decisions and what are our options?

What are the issues/topics that need to be addressed for this process to be useful to your interests?

- Focus on interests while balancing science and advocacy.
- Ensure that the products from this process are usable.
- Set habitat parameters.
- Identify what the fish need.
- Address predation issues (i.e., sea lions).
- Provide presentations on lifecycle modeling: how to begin “dial turning” and go from the MPG level to abundance targets?
- How will the goals and numbers be used? For the goals that already exist, what happens to those? This will help to narrow the focus.
- Look at information across the Hs.

- Where do we need to go with fish at the MPG level? Maybe work on the MPG level in a couple of different areas.
- Determine the scope. Will we look at all populations or a specific MPG?
- Develop a common set of goals for each MPG and a list of threats in the basin.
- Provide visualizations/maps; discuss geography.
- How will the basin be divided into tributaries?
- We need to address effective water and energy use for all users (get the best bang for the buck).
- How will we test solutions and incorporate them before making assumptions.
- Relationship building activities needs to take place.

What are the related information needs?

- There is a need for maps to jump start this information.
- What is the warm water loss?
- How much water is enough for fish and how much is too much? Sometimes we are looking to provide less water.
- Consider looking at salmon cannon technology.
- What is the available science? Make it accessible and simplistic so that it is easy to digest.
- It would be helpful to get a good understanding of options; what things need to give in order to have goals/objectives, such as flows, hatcheries, and habitat.
- What are the numbers of fish that task force members would support?
- What can states do and not do? Identify this by working with governors' offices.
- What is the abundance of weak stock?
- What are the mortality rates?
- What are the threats?

Proposed Approach Going Forward, Next Steps, and Summary – Barry Thom, NOAA Fisheries and Deb Nudelman, Kearns & West

Deb asked task force members, based on the above discussions, how they can conduct between meeting tasks to be effective for upcoming meetings. The participants worked to confirm the action items from the meeting and who would complete which tasks and by when as follows.

- **Draft Operating Principles** – The task force members will review the Draft Operating Principles after the meeting, provide their feedback and any revisions, and finalize and strive to adopt the principles at the next meeting.
- **2017 proposed meeting dates/locations** – Kearns & West will work with the NOAA Fisheries' project team to confirm an alternative April date for the next meeting and work to settle on dates and locations for the remaining meetings this year. After the meeting, April 18, 8 am – 5 pm and April 19, 8 am – 1 pm was confirmed as the second CBP Task Force meeting in 2017.

- **Field trips** – Kearns & West will work to identify and confirm a field trip in coordination with the next meeting.
- **Working Team** – Deb asked task force members whether they would like to participate in a Working Team to provide between-meeting assistance in developing substantive topics for task force consideration. During the meeting and through follow-up with absentee members, members volunteered or invited technical staff to participate including: Bill Bradbury invited Tucker Jones; Randy Friedlander invited Casey Baldwin; Guy Norman invited Dan Rawding; Zach Penney; Jim Yost invited Paul Kline; Tony Grover invited Nancy Leonard; Mike Edmudson; Bert Bowler; Jeff Grizzel; Joe Lukas; Steve Martin; Ben Enticknap; and Heath Heikkila.
- **Coordinating Team** – Deb asked task force members whether they would like to participate in the Coordinating Team to provide between-meeting assistance in developing agenda topics and process-related tasks for task force consideration. During the meeting and through follow-up with absentee members, members volunteered to participate including: Bob Austin; Tony Grover; Liz Hamilton; Marla Harrison; Joe Lukas; Guy Norman; Jim Yost; Jennifer Anders; Kevin Scriber; Randy Friedlander; Norm Semanko; Bill Bradbury; Rob Masonis; Zach Penney; and Glen Spain.
- **MAFAC CBP Task Force Co-Chair** – Deb asked task force members whether they would like to nominate a member as the co-chair and participants stated that they did not think they needed one at this time.
- **Draft Meeting Summary** - The high level meeting notes will be distributed via email and the presentations from this workshop will be posted to CBP Task Force website.

Meeting Acknowledgements and Summary

Deb thanked the presenters for their time and effort and attendees for their insightful and thoughtful questions and comments.

Barry thanked everyone for their attendance and attention. He stated that the project team will consider any feedback and comments received regarding the structure of the task force meeting and work with the Working and Coordinating Teams to develop substantive topics and a process approach for the next meeting. He asked members to consider how they will describe and integrate the existing goals in the basin and what the timeframe they are looking at for short and long-term goals. He thanked the group for their collaborative efforts and willingness to come together on these issues to discuss goals for salmon and steelhead recovery. He was heartened by the interactions and dialogue and hopes that the group can move forward together.

Deb thanked the presenters, task force members, and audience for their attention and participation. The meeting was adjourned at 3:40 pm.

| Upcoming Meeting Dates | Who | Location |
|--|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • April 18 & 19 • June 27 & 28 • September 25 & 27 • December 5 & 6 | CBP Task Force Members | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portland • Wenatchee • Boise • Spokane |
| Action Items | Who | By When |
| 1. Distribute Draft Operating Principles for revision/comment | K&W to Task Force members | Complete |
| 2. Develop and distribute January 24 & 25 Draft Meeting Summary for review and comment | Project Team to Task Force members | Complete |
| 3. Schedule webinar for those that missed the January 24 & 25 meeting | K&W/NOAA Fisheries/Absentee Task Force members | Occurred on 3/14 |
| 4. Schedule Working Team call | Working Team Members | Occurred on 3/15 |
| 5. Schedule Coordinating Team call | Coordinating Team | Occurred for 3/23 |
| 6. Create visuals/maps to show what everyone is doing in each area, the existing habitat, what is recoverable, economic needs, ecosystem needs. | Project Team | Prior to April 18 and 19 meeting |

| Bin List Topics |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a matrix of various goals in the Columbia River Basin with the drivers; then focus and prioritize |
| Meeting Materials |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed Agenda • Federal Register Notice • PowerPoint #1: FACA and MAFAC Overview • PowerPoint #2: Task Force Overview • PowerPoint #3: Proposed Process Scope and Framework • PowerPoint #4: Where are we now? Current Fish and Fishery Status • PowerPoint #5: Regulatory and Policy Background on Goals • PowerPoint #6: A Case Example, Grand Ronde Spring Chinook • PowerPoint #7: MAFAC CBP Task Force Work Approach • PowerPoint #8: MAFAC CBP Task Force Developing a Work Plan <p>The above meeting materials can be found on the NOAA Fisheries CBP Task Force website here: http://www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov/columbia_river/index.html</p> |